

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
EASTERN DISTRICT OF MICHIGAN
SOUTHERN DIVISION

GIRISH SHAH,

Plaintiff,

Civil Action No.
09-CV-12709

vs.

HON. MARK A. GOLDSMITH

NXP SEMICONDUCTORS
USA, INC.,

Defendant.

**ORDER ADOPTING THE RECOMMENDATION CONTAINED IN THE
MAGISTRATE JUDGE'S REPORT AND RECOMMENDATION AND GRANTING IN
PART AND DENYING IN PART THE PARTIES' CROSS-MOTIONS FOR REVIEW OF
CLERK'S ORDER ON TAXATION OF COSTS**

This matter is presently before the Court on the Report and Recommendation (R&R) of Magistrate Judge R. Steven Whalen, issued on March 6, 2013. In the R&R, the Magistrate Judge recommends that the parties' cross-motions for review of clerk's order on taxation of costs (Dkts. 43, 46) be granted in part and denied in part. In sum, the Magistrate Judge recommends that costs be taxed in favor of Defendant in the total amount of \$2,664.63.

The parties have not filed objections to the R&R, and the time to do so has expired. See Fed. R. Civ. P. 72(b)(2). The failure to file a timely objection to an R&R constitutes a waiver of the right to further judicial review. See Thomas v. Arn, 474 U.S. 140, 150 (1985) ("It does not appear that Congress intended to require district court review of a magistrate's factual or legal conclusions, under a de novo or any other standard, when neither party objects to those findings."); Smith v. Detroit Fed'n of Teachers, 829 F.2d 1370, 1373-4 (6th Cir. 1987) (failure to file objection to R&R "waived subsequent review of the matter"); Cephas v. Nash, 328 F.3d

98, 1078 (2d Cir. 2003) (“As a rule, a party’s failure to object to any purported error or omission in a magistrate judge’s report waives further judicial review of the point.”); Lardie v. Birkett, 221 F. Supp. 2d 806, 807 (E.D. Mich. 2002) (“As to the parts of the report and recommendation to which no party has objected, the Court need not conduct a review by any standard.”). There is some authority that a district court is required to review the R&R for clear error, see Fed. R. Civ. P. 72 Advisory Committee Note Subdivision (b) (“When no timely objection is filed, the court need only satisfy itself that there is no clear error on the face of the record in order to accept the recommendation.”). Therefore, the Court has reviewed the R&R for clear error. On the face of the record, the Court finds no clear error and adopts the recommendation.

Accordingly, the parties’ cross-motions for review of clerk’s order on taxation of costs are granted in part and denied in part in accordance with the Magistrate Judge’s recommendation, and Defendant’s costs are taxed in the total amount of \$2,664.63.

SO ORDERED.

Dated: March 25, 2013
Flint, Michigan

s/Mark A. Goldsmith
MARK A. GOLDSMITH
United States District Judge

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

The undersigned certifies that the foregoing document was served upon counsel of record and any unrepresented parties via the Court's ECF System to their respective email or First Class U.S. mail addresses disclosed on the Notice of Electronic Filing on March 25, 2013.

s/Deborah J. Goltz
DEBORAH J. GOLTZ
Case Manager